



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

76
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/526,285 | 03/02/2005 | Nitin Bhalachandra Dharmadhikari | 006420.00004 | 4683 |

22908 7590 12/02/2005
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
TEN SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 3000
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

GRAFFEO, MICHEL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1614

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/526,285 | Applicant(s) DHARMADHIKARI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Michel Graffeo | Art Unit 1614 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,23 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/2/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Action

The preliminary Amendment (Filed March 2, 2005) canceled claims 19-22 and 25-26. Claims 1-18 and 23-24 are pending and examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The amount of mexaxalone “used” is unclear in what it means. For purposes of this examination, Examiner will interpret the phrase to mean that the pharmaceutical composition contains from 400 to 1600mg of metaxalone.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term “high-energy” is unclear in its meaning in the claims and is not defined in the Specification.

Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. The term "undersized" is unclear in its meaning in the claims and is not defined in the Specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim s 8 and 12-14 recite the broad recitation wherein the particles are composed of 99% undersized value between 10 and 40µm, and the claim also recites that the particles are composed of

Art Unit: 1614

90% undersized value between 6 and 30µm which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,407,128 to Scaife et al.

Scaife et al. teach a pharmaceutical composition comprising a 400mg tablet, inclusive of excipients, (in current claims 1-2 and 15; see col 1 lines 28-29) of metaxalone (in current claims 1-2 and 15; see Treatment A in col 3 lines 14-15) having an enhanced oral bioavailability and necessary increased solubility in that it is dosed with food (in current claims 1-2 and 15; see Title and Abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1614

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,407,128 to Scaife et al. in view of US Patent No. 6,030,988 to Gilis et al.

Scaife et al. teach a pharmaceutical composition comprising a 400mg tablet, inclusive of excipients, (in current claims 1-2 and 15; see col 1 lines 28-29) of metaxalone (in current claims 1-2 and 15; see Treatment A in col 3 lines 14-15) having an enhanced oral bioavailability and necessary increased solubility in that it is dosed with food (in current claims 1-2 and 15; see Title and Abstract).

Scaife et al. do not teach any particular values for the size of the metaxalone particles in the dosage form nor name any particular solubilizing agent such as monoglyceride for example.

Gilis et al. teach a micronized formulation of cisapride, inclusive of a solubilizing agent such as monoglycerides (in current claim 7; see col 9 line 45) wherein at most 50% of the particles may have a diameter larger than 24 μm which allows for particle

Art Unit: 1614

sizes of 40 μm , 30 μm and 10 μm (in current claims 8,11-14; see col 5 lines 45-50) and a surface area per unit volume of more than $14 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2/\text{kg}$, which when compared based on a $1\text{cc}=1\text{g}$ (for water) basis equates to an amount more than $1400 \text{ m}^2/\text{kg}$ (Applicant is invited to question Examiner's calculations) and since the particle size ranges in the reference are the same as in the instant claims the ranges for the surface area unit volume must also be the same (in current claims 9-11; see col 5 lines 39-45).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the above references and as combined would teach the invention as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Scaife et al. with Gilis et al. since Scaife et al. cites Gilis et al. Thus, the combined references teach and make prima facie obvious how to use the claimed invention at the time that it was made.

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,407,128 to Scaife et al. as applied to claims 1-15 above in view of US Patent No. 6,099,859 to Cheng et al.

Scaife et al. do not teach a pharmaceutical comprising a wetting agent such as sodium lauryl sulfate.

Cheng et al. teach a pharmaceutical comprising sodium lauryl sulfate (in current claims 16-18; see col 7 lines 35-40 in Example 2).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the above references and as combined would teach the invention as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Scaife et al. with Cheng et al. since

Art Unit: 1614

Scaife et al. cites Cheng et al. Thus, the combined references teach and make prima facie obvious how to use the claimed invention at the time that it was made.

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,407,128 to Scaife et al. as applied to claims 1-15 above.

Although Scaife et al. do not particularly recite a pharmaceutical composition comprising metaxalone and another analgesic, combining agents which are known to be useful as analgesics individually into a single composition useful for the very same purpose is prima facie obvious. See *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069.

Since it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose, the idea of combining analgesics flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michel Graffeo whose telephone number is 571-272-8505. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am to 5:30pm Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

9 November 2005
MG

MB


CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600